

TRINITY CITY PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING Tuesday, May 23 2006 7:00 pm

The Trinity Planning Board held their May 23, 2006 Regular Planning and Zoning Board Meeting at Trinity City Hall, 6701 NC Highway 62, Trinity. A quorum was present.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman, Robbie Sikes; Planning Members, David Albertson, J. R. Ewings, Linda Gantt, Vernel Gibson, Buddy Maness, Scott Norman.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Melvin Patterson

OTHERS PRESENT: Mayor, Fran Andrews; City Manager, Ann Bailie, Planning/Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer, Adam Stumb; and City Clerk/FO Debbie Hinson, and members of the audience.

ITEM 1. Call to Order

Chairman Sikes called the May 23, 2006 Meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

ITEM 2. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Sikes led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEM 3. Invocation

Planning Board member Gibson gave the invocation.

ITEM 4. Approval of Minutes April 25, 2006

Chairman Sikes called for any changes or corrections to the April 25, 2006 Minutes.

Planning Member Ewings made a motion to approve the minutes as written, seconded by Planning member Albertson and approved unanimously by all Planning members present.

7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

ITEM 5. Public Comments Section

John Maddocks, 3863 Fox Meadow Road, Trinity: Mr. Maddocks extended greetings from the Chamber and advised members that the Chamber will have someone attending their future meetings.

New Business

ITEM 6. Special Intensity Allocation #SIA06-05

Chairman Sikes opened this item and turned discussion over to Mr. Stumb.

Mr. Stumb advised members this request was for Lot # 99 in the Colonial Village Development and was zoned for commercial use. The developer was requesting the full allocation of 70% or 39,000 square feet for a retail building that can be divided into 9 units. The developer is short on parking spaces per the

Ordinance. The Ordinance requires 66 parking spaces and his plan indicates only 58 parking spaces. Staff is working with the builder to allocate the appropriate parking spaces per the Ordinance. Mr. Stumb advised members that this lot will tie into the Subway lot and that the drive will connect at the top of the lot with a driveway. Each lot will have a driveway cut onto Unity but only one (1) entrance into the site. There currently is no connection to lot # 98; however, this lot will connect to the Subway lot as well when developed. Members, Manager Bailie, and Mr. Stumb discussed the type of building that was planned by the developer, the covered walkway that was shown on the plan, the installation of sidewalks and curb and gutter. Mr. Stumb advised members the developer had not indicated the building materials for this site and that the covered walkway would serve as a connecter walkway for this building. Sidewalks will be installed in front of the unit along Unity Street as well as some curb and gutter located inside the parking lot. Trees will be planted on Unity Street along the front of the building outside of the Right of Way.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of a Special Intensity Allocation not to exceed 70% (39,335 sq/ft)

Planning Board Recommendation: Motion by Planning Member Maness to approve Special Intensity Allocation not to exceed 70% (39,335 sq/ft) allocation as requested by the developer, seconded by Planning Member Ewings, and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present.

7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

ITEM 7. Fee Schedule Update

Chairman Sikes opened this item and turned discussion over to Mr. Stumb.

Mr. Stumb discussed with members the increased number of requests for commercial and industrial development. Due to the extra inspections and plan review needed with these types of development the costs of the engineering services have begun to increase and staff believes this additional cost should be passed on to the applicant. Staff has discussed with City contract engineers the increased costs associated with technical review of commercial, industrial and multi-family development plans and asked that they provide what they felt was an appropriate fee to provide these services. They have suggested a flat fee in the amount of \$100.00 and \$6.00 per 1000 square feet. This fee is strictly for commercial, industrial, multi-family development or development on the larger scale. These fees will not apply to residential development, new homes, garage, or additions which will remain \$25.00 for the Zoning Permit Fee. Mr. Stumb advised members that he calculated the costs for this development using the new fee schedule and the calculation totaled \$170.00 in comparison to the current \$25.00 Permit Fee.

There was a brief discussion between members and Mr. Stumb in regards to the fee increase. Mr. Stumb advised members that for normal building such as he discussed earlier the additional inspection fees were not necessary and the \$25.00 Permit Fee was adequate. However, since development of commercial and multi-family requests have increased as well as the necessity for inspection for such projects by the engineer in regards to plan review, stormwater, and infrastructure inspections needed for these types of developments the city can not absorb the costs. The fee proposed was calculated to provide an offset of the costs for engineering services incurred by the city for review of these projects.

Staff Recommendation: Adopting a fee of \$100.00 + \$6.00 per 1,000 sq/ft for commercial, industrial, and multi family development and maintaining the \$25.00 fee for new single family residential including additions and accessory structures.

Planning Board Recommendation: Motion by Planning Member Maness to accept Staff
Recommendation for the proposed Fee Schedule Update, seconded by Planning Member Norman and
approved unanimously by all Planning Members present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

ITEM 8. Table of Permitted Uses

Chairman Sikes opened this item and turned discussion over to Mr. Stumb.

Mr. Stumb reviewed the following changes with members for their approval or denial.

Page 18- Agriculture Uses- Crops: Agricultural Uses for field crops are allowed in all Zoning Districts except R-12 as permitted uses. This change incorporates the latest action taken by Council. Agricultural Uses- Livestock: Per Council Action this use will be allowed only in RA with a minimum limit of 2 ½ acres of property.

Page 19-Home & Garden Supply Retail, over 25,000 sq. feet: This use is currently allowed in M-1 and M-2 as a Special Use. Staff recommends adding this use to the Highway Commercial District as a Special Use in that district as well.

Motion by Planning Member Sikes to allow Home & Garden Supply Retail over 25,000 sq. ft in Highway Commercial as a Special Use as well as the M-1 and M-2 Zoning Districts, seconded by Planning Member Gant and approved unanimously by all Planning Members Present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

Page 20- Hotels/Motels: This use is currently only allowed in CS. Staff recommends this use be allowed in the Highway Commercial District as well as a Permitted Use.

Motion by Planning Member Ewings to add Hotels/Motels to Highway Commercial as a permitted use, seconded by Planning Member Albertson, and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

Page 20- Mini Warehouse/Storage Buildings: This use is currently allowed as Special Use in MF-R and RM and Permitted Use in M1 and M2. Staff recommends that this use be discontinued in MF-R and RM and allowed only in M1 and M2.

After discussion among members, Planning Member Gant made a motion to delete Mini Warehouse/Storage Buildings from MF-R and RM Zoning Districts and to allow this use in the M-1, M-2 zoning districts Permitted Uses as well as the addition to Highway Commercial as a Permitted Use, seconded by Planning Member Gibson and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

Page 21- Retail and Membership Warehouse Establishments, over 25,000 sq/ft.: This use is currently allowed as a Special Use in the M-1 and M-2 Zoning Districts. Staff recommends that this use be allowed in the Highway Commercial District as a Special Use as well.

Motion by Planning Member Norman to add Retail and Membership Warehouse Establishments, over 25,000 sq/ft to the Highway Commercial Zoning District as a Special Use, seconded by Planning Member Ewings and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present.

7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

Page 22- Shooting Range- Outdoor: This use is currently allowed in RA, R-40, and M-1 as Special Use. Mr. Stumb asked members if they wished to keep this as it was currently listed or if they wished to make changes.

After discussion, Motion by Planning Member Ewings to delete Shooting Range-Outdoor from RA and R-40 and to allow this use in M-1 only as a Special Use, seconded by Member Gibson and approved by a 6 to 1 vote with Planning Member Sikes voting Nay. 6 to 1 (Member Patterson absent)

Page 22- Storage Buildings and Mini Warehouses: This use seems to be a duplicate of Mini Warehouses/Storage Buildings listed on page 20. Staff recommends deleting this completely from the Table of Uses.

Motion by Planning Member Albertson to delete this description from the Table of Uses as recommended by staff, seconded by Planning Member Ewings and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

Page 22- Tattoo and Body Piercing: This use is currently a Special Use in the CS Zoning District. Staff feels this use may be more appropriate in the M-1 Zoning District as a Permitted Use.

Motion by Planning Member Gibson to delete this use in CS and allow in the M-1 Zoning District as a permitted use, seconded by Planning Member Ewings and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

The following changes were discussed by Member Gant with members and Mr. Stumb. After discussion the changes are reflected as follows:

Page 19-Family Care Homes: There was discussion concerning this use in MF-R and RM and the possibility of deleting this use in these 2 districts. Mr. Stumb advised members that the use could be deleted from the MF-R but because of North Carolina Law must be allowed in Residential areas and could not be deleted from any other district.

Motion by Planning Member Gant to delete this use from MF-R, seconded by Planning Member Gibson and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

After the vote, Manager Bailie and Mr. Stumb advised members that staff would prepare text amendments specifying that Family Care Homes would not be permitted in multi-family developments within an RM Zoning District.

Page 20- Laboratory, Medical and Dental: Members discussed the current zoning districts of CS, M-1 and M-2 where this use was currently allowed. After discussion, Motion by Planning Member Ewings to add this use to Office/Institution and Highway Commercial as well as CS, M-1 and M-2 as Permitted Uses, seconded by Planning Member Norman and approved unanimously by all members present. 7 to 0 (Member Patterson absent)

ITEM 9. Comments from the Board None

ITEM 10. Comments from Staff

Mr. Stumb thanked members for their dedication and willingness to serve since the time needed to conduct business for this board has increased.

Manager Bailie briefed Planning Members on the decisions of Council at their May 16, 2006 Regular Meeting in regards to recommendations made by the Planning/Zoning Board. She also asked Planning Members to submit their feed back sheets on the Land Use Plan to her and reminded members of the Community Meeting that would be held on this item on June 08, 2006.

ITEM 11. Adjourn

With no other business to discuss, *Planning Member Maness made a motion to adjourn the May 23, 2006 Regular Meeting of the Trinity Planning/Zoning Board, seconded by Planning Member Ewings, and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present.*

These minutes were approved by the City of Trinity Planning/Zoning Board at their Regularly Scheduled Meeting held on June 27, 2006 upon motion by Planning Member Maness, seconded by Planning Member Albertson, and approved unanimously by all Planning members present.